DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 307 237 SP 031 142

TITLE	Preparing Academically Talented Students for Teaching. Final Report. Part C: Practice Profile.
INSTITUTION	Kent State Univ., Ohio.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Feb 89
NOTE	85p.; For related documents, see SP 031 140-141.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academically Gifted; Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; Individualized Instruction; Institutional Cooperation; Mentors; Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Administration; *Program Effectiveness; Student Characteristics; *Student Recruitment; Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Education Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Alternative Teacher Education Program; Kent State University OH

ABSTRACT

The Alternative Teacher Education Program (ATEP) at Kent State University features the selection of academically able students, an inter-institutional planning council, the matching of a master teacher with a preservice teacher for a 2-year period, an individualized course of study jointly designed by the faculty advisor and student, and the replacement of pre-professional teacher education coursework with a series of inquiry-oriented seminars. This practice profile describes the student, faculty, school district and program characteristics, and also implementation requirements. Charts synthesize the program components in terms of ideal, acceptable, and unacceptable practices. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED307237

PREPARING ACADEMICALLY TALENTED STUDENTS FOR TEACHING

FINAL REPORT

PART C: PRACTICE PROFILE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY
KENT, OHIO

FINAL REPORT

FEBRUARY, 1989

SP031 142

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT PRACTICE PROFILE

PROJECT: Alternative Teacher Education Program

I. PROJECT DEMOGRAPHICS

Student Characteristics

Cohort Size:	Between 25 and 30 students are selected each Spring Semester to form a Cohort group.
Student Characteristics:	Interested students complete a rigorous application process designed to evaluate: Academic ability (g.p.a. (3.4/4.0) Writing ability Critical thinking and problem solving Interpersonal skills Leadership potential Academic aptitute (A.C.T. combined score of 25+) Minority, physically challenged, and non-traditional students are encouraged to apply.
College Affiliation:	Approximately half of all students are enrolled in both the Honors College and another college. Approximately half are enrolled as majors in the College of Education. About one-third are enrolled in the College of Arts and Sciences. The remaining one-sixth are enrolled in the College of Fine and Professional Arts.
Certification:	ATEP students may seek certification in any teaching field. The majority seek certification in two secondary areas. About one-third seek certification in early childhood, elementary, and/or special education. Ten percent seek certification in K-12 specialty areas (art and music). Overall, most students will graduate with certification in two areas. These areas represent 22 teaching fields.
Age/Sex:	Students ages range from 19 to 43. Ten are considered "non-traditional" based on university criteria. Thirty-three females and and 10 males are enrolled in the first two Cohorts.

Teacher Characteristics

University Faculty: Four College of Education faculty members teach seminars. These faculty are members of the following departments: Teacher Development and Curriculum Studies and Educational Foundations. Faculty are chosen for their inquiry-oriented teaching styles and their reputation as excellent teacher-scholars.

School-Based Mentors: Forty three teacher volunteers recommended by university faculty and school district administrators serve as mentors.

Potential mentors, who have at least three years of teaching experience, are nominated on the following critera: use of a vareity of teaching methods; development of positive relationships within the school (students, parents, administrators, colleagues); willingness to work and share classroom with an undergraduate student for an extended time period. ATEP students and mentors jointly decide to work together during the student's first semester in the program.

LEVEL	NUMBER
High School	21
Junior High/Middle School	5
Elementary	8
Special Education	4
Specialty (art, music)	5

School District Characteristics

Demographics: Mentorships are located in four counties in Northeaster Ohio and include 12 public school districts, 23 public and one private school The schools are located in urban, suburban, and rural areas. The individual distrcits and schools vary in socioeconomic status and size.

Program Characteristics

The program is designed to produce beginning teachers who are competent in both the art and the craft of teaching. Special features of the program include the selection of academically able students, an inter-institutional Planning Council, the matching of a master teacher with a preservice teacher for a two-year period, the individualized course of study jointly designed by the faculty advisor and student, and the replacement of pre-professional teacher education coursework with a series of inquiry-oriented seminars.

This program uses a systematic apporach to identify, recruit and select academically talented undergraduate students for a highly personalized teacher education program. The preservice teachers participate in thrity hours of accelerated, individualized courswork and field experiences which have as their core a sequence of research-based seminars. Three seminars (4 credit hours each), Inquiry into Teaching, Inquiry into Learning, and Inquiry into Schooling, are taken in subsequent semesters. Each is combined with practica (mentorships) in which the concepts learned in the seminars are validated. The three seminars are followed by a full-semester internship which is accompanied by a seminar, Research in Teaching (18 total credit hours). The program incorporates extant reseach on teaching, learning and schools as it involves preservice teachers in conducting their own research. In additional to the 30 credit hour professional studies component, the preservice teacher takes a broad background of coursework in the liberal arts.

Instruction is research- and inquiry-based. The seminars are discursive , with a different mode of inquiry for each; sociological for the first, psychological for the second, critical thinking for the third. The field experiences are substantial and sustained, promoting strong relationships among students and their mentors and emphasizing continual inquiry into teaching/learning/schooling. Each student completes a research project during the internship.

II. IMPLEMENTATION REQUIREMENTS

COSTS: Budget Considerations include:

- Stipends for mentor teachers
- Stipends for School Personnel and Planning Council
- Graduate Assistant (research)
- 1/2 time Project Coordinator
- faculty instructional time for seminars

An annual estimate for these expenses at our university is $64,000.

TRAINING: Sessions are held for mentor teachers each semester. Discussions have a problem-solving orientation. Each summer a one-week training session is held for potential mentors on supervising students in field experiences.

MATERIALS/
EQUIPMENT: No special materials or equipment are required.

PERSONNEL: In addition to the university faculty members who teach the seminars and the mentor teachers who provide support to students during field experiences, the project has required a faculty coordinator and an administrative coordinator.

ORGANIZATIONAL
ARRANGEMENTS:

No additional organizational arrangements were needed to implement the program.

I. A. Organizing and Maintaining Partnerships

COMPONENT: ESTABLISHING A COLLABORATIVE PLANNING COUNCIL

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
1. Identify project "stakeholders" e.g. College of Education faculty, Faculty from Arts and Sciences, Honors College representatives, representatives from cooperating school districts and college students, who are interested in program development in Teacher Education.	1. Same as ideal.	1. Select an advisory committee who are not broadly represented or who are pressured to be part of the group.
2. Appoint a Planning Council; make clear the responsibilities of development, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation.	2. Same as ideal.	2. Do not specify roles and responsibilities.
3. Identify areas for specific study. Members volunteer to serve on task force in identified area; each task force has constituent representation: * recruitment and selection of students * program design * advising * mentoring	3. Whole group contributes to the design of each aspect of the program.	3. Program director presents all aspects of the program with little input from the group.
4. Plan and specify a calendar of regular meetings (with special consideration to school personnel constraints) and a roster of participants.	4. Call meetings on an as-needed basis.	4. Call meetings randomly.
5. Provide agendas for each meeting and subsequent minutes for each meeting which allow for and encourage interaction among members.	5. Structure the agenda at the onset of each meeting; provide minutes.	5. Have no structure to the meetings.

I. B. Organizing and Maintaining Partnerships

COMPONENT: IDENTIFYING PROGRAM COMPONENTS

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
1. Review literature on teacher education program development in identified areas of study.	1. Same as ideal	1. Use opinion or past personal experience as basis for decision-making.
2. Assess key interests of Planning Council through Nominal Group Process Technique (N.G.T.) using the questions, "What should an alternative program for academically talented students be?"	2. Use Delphi Technique or structured interview to get Planners' perception.	2. Project director formulates the program components.
3. Determine key "informants" and experts to advise Planning Council on matters of program design: * recent graduates * school experts * curriculum experts	3. Same as ideal	3. Do not consult with others; make all decisions independently.
4. Establish a sorting structure for data collected, e.g., Cruickshank's (1983) categories.	4. Same as ideal	4. Sort data on hunch.
5. Review findings from data collection and select most relevant program elements.	5. Same as ideal	5. Select program elements of choice.
6. Establish subcommittees to determine the scope of work for each "improvement" identified.	6. Same as ideal	6. Have project director determine all improvements.

I. C. Organizing and Maintaining Partnerships

COMPONENT: SUPPORT FEATURES

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
1. Representatives of the faculty from the Honors College, College of Arts and Science, and College of Fine and Professional Arts as well as students volunteer to participate as members of the Planning Council.	1. Faculty members from external colleges are selected by their college administrators and students are appointed to participate on Planning Council.	1. No external college representatives or students participate.
2. Representatives from the public schools receive a stipend for participating on Planning Council.	2. Same as ideal	2. Public school members of the Planning Council do not receive a stipend.
3. Mentors receive a stipend each semester for their work with students.	3. Same as ideal	3. Mentors do not receive a stipend.
4. Mentors may enroll in a tuition-free two credit hour workshop which is designed to provide teachers with knowledge of current trends and issues in the supervision of students during field experiences.	4. Workshop tuition for mentors is partially funded.	4. Mentors must pay full tuition for workshop.

I. D. Organizing and Maintaining Partnerships

COMPONENT: EVIDENCE OF SUCCESSFUL COLLABORATION

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
1. Formal program evaluation is completed each year by at least 75% of the Planning Council members. The written evaluation includes self-report, quantitative (forced choice) and qualitative (open-ended) data.	1. Formal program evaluation is completed every two years by at least 60% of the Planning Council members. Evaluation information also is collected informally at meetings.	1. No formal program evaluation is conducted. Evaluation information is collected informally meetings.
2. Criteria are used to define successful collaboration: * 90% of membership attend all or most of meetings * Quantitative data reflects agreement by achieving a mean of 2 or less on a 5 point scale (1=agree; 5=disagree) * Qualitative data reflects members contributions, personal benefits, positive and negative aspects of collaboration, and suggest improvements.	2. Same as ideal	2. Set of criteria for defining successful collaboration is developed.
3. At least 75% of all Planning Council members attend each meeting.	3. At least 60% of all Planning Council members attend each meeting.	3. Meetings are attended by less than 60% of the membership.

I. D. Organizing and Maintaining Partnerships

COMPONENT: EVIDENCE OF SUCCESSFUL COLLABORATION

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
4. Spontaneous collaboration is encouraged, facilitated, and sustained by program staff: * among mentors in various schools districts - shared lists of names/numbers - arranged meetings * among faculty within various program areas - shared information about designing individualized programs for students - arranged informal meetings * among four "alternative" teacher education programs in College of Education - research-based collaborative articles and presentations - working together to design and improve programs	4. Spontaneous collaboration is encouraged but not facilitated or sustained by project staff.	4. Spontaneous collaboration does not occur.

II. A. Recruitment and Selection Process

COMPONENT: STUDENTS

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
1. Identify students who are academically successful in college and develop a pool of potential candidates. Criteria for success in college: * grade point of 3.4 or better * ACT combined score of at least 25	1. Same as ideal	1. Providing a random pool of candidates with no regard for academic success.
2. Send personalized letters of invitation to potential candidates with a clear description of the program.	2. Send letters to potential candidates.	2. Send form letter.
3. Hold information generating sessions for students to ask questions and discuss concerns with program faculty and students in the program.	3. Same as ideal	3. Have no question and answer session.
4. Develop criteria which address the qualities of students entering the program and the program goals: a) Academic ability b) Ability to plan and work independently c) Ability to understand, analyze, and synthesize concepts d) Writing ability e) Interpersonal communication skills f) Leadership potential g) Critical thinking ability h) Commitment to teaching i) Breadth of life experiences	4. Identification criteria are specified but are unrelated to program goals.	4. No criteria are specified for admission.

II. A. Recruitment and Selection Process (Continued)

COMPONENT: STUDENTS

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
5. Provide an application process which is challenging for the student. The application should allow for data to be collected for the assessment of specific criteria related to program goals: * Transcripts (a) * Letters of recommendations (b,c,e,f) * Writing samples (c,d,g,h) * Personal data sheet (i)	**5.** Same as ideal	**5.** Application process is a formality and not used to select students.
6. A team approach is used to review applications and to select students. The team is composed of university faculty members, school personnel, and student in the program.	**6.** A team composed of university faculty reads applications and selects students.	**6.** All applicants that apply are accepted without review.
7. Selected students represent a heterogeneous group differing in content area specialization, grade level of certification sought, and background (e.g., non-traditional, minority and handicapped students are viewed as beneficial to program).	**7.** Top-ranked applicants are selected without regard to content area specialization or type of certification sought.	**7.** Selected students represent a relatively homogeneous grouping No attempt is made to select non-traditional, minority handicapped students.

13

II. B. Recruitment and Selection Process

COMPONENT - SCHOOL-BASED MENTORS

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
1. Teachers who are viewed as outstanding in the classroom and in working with university students are identified by College of Education faculty, student teaching supervisors, current mentors, Planning Council members, and school district administrators through a nomination process. A pool of potential mentors is developed. Criteria: * knowledgeable in field/content area * flexible * organized * reflective * "willing to serve" * encouraging * desire to advance profession * enthusiasm for teaching * risk-taking orientation	**1.** Same as ideal	**1.** Teachers are randomly assigned by university or school administrators to work with students. No recommendations are permitted from other sources.
2. Schools districts are sent names of the mentors and their cooperation for teacher participation is sought.	**2.** Same as ideal	**2.** No additional information is sent to school districts.
3. Personalized letters of invitation are sent to potential mentors with a clear description of the program.	**3.** Send form letters and program brochures to potential mentors.	**3.** No letters are sent.

II. B. Recruitment and Selection Process (Continued)

COMPONENT - SCHOOL-BASED MENTORS

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
4. Information gathering sessions are held for teachers to meet students and to explore the roles and responsibilities of ATEP mentors. * two year commitment * weekly contract * contractual arrangement	**4.** Same as ideal	**4.** No information sessions are held.
5. Teachers who determine their desire to mentor are provided with mentor application forms used for matching mentors with students; student complete similar forms to share in person with prospective mentors.	**5.** Provide opportunity for face-to-face discussion of teachers and students to get acquainted.	**5.** No application process is used.
6. Students review mentor application forms and visit prospective mentors' classroom.	**6.** Students visit classrooms to meet prospective mentors.	**6.** No classrooms or teachers are visited.

III. A. Instructional Content

COMPONENT: PROGRAM DESIGN

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
1. Four seminars (13-17 semester credit hours) replace the pre-professional coursework required for traditional teacher education students. Coursework replaced is: * Intro to Education (2 hours) * Human Development and Learning (3 hours) * School and Society (3 hours) * Models of Teaching (2 hours) * Principles of Educational Media (2 hours) * Student Teaching Seminar (2 hours) * other coursework as decided by student and advisor	1. Four seminars replace some of the pre-professional coursework required in traditional program. Student and advisor jointly determine which courses are replaced.	1. Students must take most or all of the pre-professional coursework required in the traditional teacher education program in addition to four seminars. Student has little input in designing his/her educational program.
2. Full semester internship (10 - 15 semester hours) replaces student teaching (8 hours) required for traditional teacher education students.	2. Same as ideal	2. Students complete traditional sequence of six weeks of coursework followed by eight to ten weeks of student teaching during final semester.

III. B. Instructional Content

COMPONENT: INQUIRY INTO TEACHING SEMINAR

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
1. Nature/Choice of Content * Content is presented in an inquiry-oriented format which addresses two major questions: - Who and what is a teacher? - Who, where, and how do teachers teach? * Teaching students in classrooms is approached from a phenomenological perspective which considers the many sociological aspects that operate within classroom settings. * The implications of teacher roles and styles as they interact with students, who have their own individual roles and characteristics, are explored.	1. Nature/Choice of Content * Seminar is selected from course offerings in place. Two major questions are addressed. * Selected seminar approaches the nature of teaching from a phenomenological perspective. * The implications of teacher and student roles, styles, characteristics, and classroom interactions are explored.	1. Nature/Choice of Content * Student completes traditional coursework: - Intro to Education - Approaches to Teaching * Coursework does not explicitly approach the nature of teaching from a phenomenological perspective. * Differences in teacher and student roles, styles, characteristics, and classroom interactions are described. No effort is made to discuss the implications of such differences.
2. Sequencing/Integration of Content * Content learned in seminar is applied during field experiences. Students observe teachers and students in classrooms to collect information about: - questioning techniques - classroom atmosphere - teacher style, etc.	2. Sequencing/Integration of Content * Same as ideal	2. Sequencing/Integration of Content * No attempt is made to integrate field experiences with course content.
* Field placement experiences are discussed in seminar. Observations and topics are explored on the basis of: - current research - personal value system - teacher goals, roles, etc.	* Same as ideal	* No discussion of field experiences occurs in classwork or experiences are not related to current research, values, etc.

III. B. Instructional Content (Continued)

COMPONENT: INQUIRY INTO TEACHING SEMINAR

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
3. Scope of Content Key topics are presented in terms of how they affect the teaching situation: * How does the affective dimension of classroom environment influence the behavior and interactions of teachers and students? * How do different styles of learning and teaching affect each other? * How do teachers engage students in learning? * How might one explore an aspect of the teaching/learning situation that interests him/her?	3. Scope of Content Key topics are presented in terms of how they operate in classroom settings: * Why does the affective dimension of classroom environment influence teachers and students? * What styles of learning and teaching make good student/teacher matches? * What methods do teacher use to encourage student participation? * What does research on teaching tell us about various issues? How might one apply this knowledge in the future?	3. Scope of Content Key topics are presented in lectu format to answer these questions: * What is the affective dimension of the classroom environment? * What are the different styles of learning and teaching? * What is motivation? * What have we learned from research?

23

III. B. Instruction Content (Continued)

COMPONENT: INQUIRY INTO TEACHING SEMINAR

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
4. Use of Content/Assignments Students complete written assignments that integrate key topics presented and discussed in seminar with planned field experiences:	4. Use of Content/ Assignments Students complete written assignments that integrate key topics presented and discussed in seminar with available field experiences:	4. Use of Content Assignments Students complete written assignmer to expand their knowledge base or explore their personal feelings. attempt is made to integrate k topics:
Observational Analysis * After observing atypical classrooms (pre-school, special education, alternative high school), students describe interactions, state their feelings about the classroom environments, and explain their feelings based both on personal values and knowledge of research findings.	Observational Analysis * Same as ideal	Observational Analysis * Students observe classrooms and analyze them using various observational instruments. Thei feelings about the classroom are not explored or explained in writing.

III. C. Instructional Content

COMPONENT: INQUIRY INTO LEARNING SEMINAR

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
1. Nature/Choice of Content * Content is presented in a format which considers two major questions about learning and instruction: - How do students learn? - How do teachers design, implement and evaluate instruction?	1. Nature/Choice of Content * Selected seminar approaches the nature of learning from an empirical perspective.	1. Nature/Choice of Content * Coursework does not explicitly approach the nature of learning from an empirical perspective.
* Learning theories and instructional design are approached from an empirical perspective which is supported by research data. The implications research data have on instruction are explored.	* Seminar is selected from course offerings in place. Two major questions are addressed.	* Students complete traditional coursework: - Human Growth and Development - Learning Theories
2. Sequencing/Integration of Content Content learned in seminar is applied during field experiences: Reinforcement techniques Developmental level of students Affective and cognitive objectives	2. Sequencing/Integration of Content Content learned in seminar is applied during field experiences when possible.	2. Sequencing/Integration of Content Content learned in coursework is no applied to field experiences Students are not required to observ actual teachers and students or t practice teaching using conten learned.

III. C. Instructional Content

COMPONENT: INQUIRY INTO LEARNING SEMINAR

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
3. Scope of Content Key topics are presented in terms of how they affect the teaching/learning situation:	3. Scope of Content Key topics are presented in terms of how they operate in learning situations.	3. Scope of Content Key topics are presented in lecture format to answer these questions:
* How do I structure the learning environment based on behaviorist, cognitivist, humanist, and other theories?	* Same as ideal	* How do behaviorists, cognitivists and humanists teach?
* How do I synthesize learning theories to design instruction and to develop teaching strategies that work for me and my students?	* How do I synthesize learning theories to design instruction and to develop effective teaching strategies.	* How do behaviorists, cognitivists, humanists and other learning theorists design instruction?
* How do I approach content and design instruction to meet important cognitive and affective goals?	* What are the ways in which I might approach content to meet important cognitive and affective goals?	* What are cognitive and affective goals?
* How do I identify and solve classroom problems based on the knowledge gained from different learning theories?	* How might I identify and solve classroom problems, based on knowledge of different learning theories, in the future?	* What are the different learning theories?

III. C. Instructional Content

COMPONENT: INQUIRY INTO LEARNING SEMINAR

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
4. Use of Content/Assignments Students complete written assignments and projects that integrate key topics presented and discussed in seminar with field placement experiences:	**4. Use of Content/ Assignments**	**4. Use of Content/ Assignments**
* Learning Theories Paper Using a real-life example based on their experience and/or observations, students synthesize two learning theories from two different perspectives and show how both may be used together to achieve classroom goals.	* Learning Theories Paper Same as ideal	* Learning Theories Paper Students explain two or more learning theories as described by theorists.
* Examination Applying the components of learning theories to real-life situations, students analyze the similarities and differences among theories as they are applied to new problems and in terms of the assumptions made by the theorists.	* Examinations Same as ideal	* Examinations Students answer objective and/or essay questions related to key topics presented in class and readings.

III. C. Instructional Content

COMPONENT: INQUIRY INTO LEARNING SEMINAR

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
* Instructional Design Unit After selecting a topic area in a specific field of study and with a specific group of students, students develop a mini-instructional design unit that includes: - descriptions of the learners, the resources, and the constraints of the learning environment - cognitive and affective objectives - a learning hierarchy that shows the prerequisite relationships among the objectives - evaluation criteria for each objective - instructional procedures and strategies for each objective explained in terms of the learning and instruction theoretical bases - students use their units with actual students. If necessary, they revise it for future use.	* Instructional Design Unit Students develop unit for students but do not use it in their classrooms.	* Instructional Design Unit Students write lessons plans that include behavioral objectives, materials, teaching strategies, and evaluation procedures or test items. These plans may or may not be used with actual students.

33

III. D. Instructional Content

COMPONENT: INQUIRY INTO SCHOOLING SEMINAR

1. Nature/Choice of Content	1. Nature/Choice of Content	1. Nature Choice of Content
* Content is presented in an inquiry-oriented format which addresses two major questions. - How does the school as an institution and society as a whole influence educational policies and practices? - How have the dominant belief systems that have emerged in the American historical and social context directly influenced educational endeavors?	* Seminar is selected from course offerings in place. Two major questions are addressed:	* Student completes traditional coursework: - School and Society
* The situation of the lives of teachers and students in schools is approached from an ethnographic perspective and a critical analysis of assumptions and implications rooted to ideology.	* Selected seminar approaches the nature of schooling from ethnographic and social criticism perspectives.	* Coursework does not explicitly approach the nature of schoolin from ethnographic and social criticism perspectives.
* The implications of teachers and students lives in schools as they relate to others in the school, community and larger society are explored. Students are encouraged to clarify their beliefs abut these implications and to suggest ways in which they might make improvements.	* Same as ideal	* Students are taught what to expect in the schools and how to operate within the education system as it exists today. No effort is made to discuss the implications of the system, nor are students encouraged to make improvements.

41

III. D. Instructional Content

COMPONENT: INQUIRY INTO SCHOOLING SEMINAR

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
2. Sequencing/Integration of Content	2. Sequencing/Integration of Content	2. Sequencing/Integration of Content
* Content learned in seminars is used to help students move from unexamined personal perspectives and views to the sharing of them, and finally to the examination of educational literature and research, which is then used to support or to refute personal views. - Desegregation - Mainstreaming - Student Rights	* Content learned in seminars is used to help students understand their personal perspectives,serves as a means for discussing topics, and is then used to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of various positions.	* No attempt is made to relate the educational literature and research to students' personal perspectives. Students are not required to examine or support their views.
* Content learned in seminar is applied during field experiences. Students reflect on situations they have seen in their schools, discuss the implications of such situations, and relate these observations to research. - Tracking - Test administration - Teacher and student behavior - Administrative concerns	* Same as ideal	* No attempt is make to integrate seminar content with field experiences.
* Content learned in seminars is used to help students analyze social forces and to assist them in shifting their perspective from that of student to that of teacher.	* Same as ideal	* Content is not explicitly designed to assist students movement from the students' to the teachers' perspective.

III. D. Instructional Content

COMPONENT: INQUIRY INTO SCHOOLING SEMINAR

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
3. Scope of Content Key topics are presented in terms of how they affect the schooling situation:	3. Scope of Content Key topics are presented in terms of how they operate within schools:	3. Scope of Content Key topics are presented in lecture format to answer these questions:
* How do the bureaucratic characteristics of the school as an organization impact on the teacher's role?	* Why do bureaucratic characteristics of the school impact on the teacher's role?	* What are the bureaucratic characteristics of schools?
* How do the characteristics of the organizational structure influence the teaching/learning process?	* Why do characteristics of the organizational structure influence the teaching/learning process?	* What characteristics of the organizational structure influence the teaching/learning process?
* What are the implications of the relationship that exists between the formal and hidden curriculum?	* What is the relationship between the formal and the hidden curriculum?	* What is the difference between the formal and the hidden curriculum?
* How do major legislative and legal decisions impact on schooling?	* What major legislative and legal decisions have impacted on schooling?	* What were the major legislative and legal educational decisions

III. D. Instructional Content

COMPONENT: INQUIRY INTO SCHOOLING SEMINAR

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
4. Use of Content/Assignments Students complete written assignments that integrate key topics presented and discussed in seminar with current research and educational literature:	4. Use of Content/ Assignments Same as ideal	4. Use of Content/Assignments Students complete written assignments that address key topics presented and/or discussed as part of their coursework. No attempt is made to integrate key topics.
* Issues Paper-Students focus on one theme to make a detailed analysis of the assumptions underlying it and its implications on educational practice. They present two opposing points of view reflecting different belief systems expressed by intelligent, sensitive advocates. Their own opinions and any changes they have experienced are presented at the end of this analysis.	* Issue Paper - Same as ideal	* Issue Paper - Either no issue paper is completed or assignment reflects personal biases or unexamined viewpoints of students. Supportive research and/or opinions are not included in the paper.
* Examinations-Students apply key concepts to practical issues in education.	* Examinations - Same as ideal	* Examination - Students answer objective and/or essay questions related to key topics presented in class and readings.
* Intellectual Journal-Students reflect on class discussions, readings, and field experiences by applying paradigms, metaphors, and conceptual themes analyzed as part of the course.	* Intellectual Journal Same as ideal	* Intellectual Journal - Students present their thoughts related to class activities, readings, and field experiences by comparing them to key topics.

III. E. Instructional Content

COMPONENT: RESEARCH IN TEACHING SEMINAR

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
1. Nature/Choice of Content	1. Nature Choice of Content	1. Nature/Choice of Content
* Content is presented in an inquiry-oriented format which addresses two major questions: - How did I learn to teach? - How will I continue to learn about teaching?	* Same as ideal	* Student completes traditional student teaching seminar.
* The implications of actual teaching in schools are explored. The choices made by teachers and the behavior exhibited by teachers are discussed.	* Same as ideal	* Teaching situations are described and discussed without considering the implications of choices and behavior.
2. Sequencing/Integration of Content	2. Sequencing/Integration of Content	2. Sequencing/Integration of Content
* Content learned in previous seminars and field experiences is applied during internship semester.	* Same as ideal	* Students did not learn same content in previous coursework therefore they do not have a common knowledge base.
* Internship experiences are integrated with knowledge and approached from personal and philosophical perspectives.	* Same as ideal	* No attempt is made to integrate knowledge base with current experiences.

43

III. E. Instructional Content

COMPONENT: RESEARCH IN TEACHING SEMINAR

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
3. Scope of Content Key topics are generated by the professor and students in terms of how they affect the teaching situations: * How do I modify the learning environment to improvement interactions, achievement, students' self-esteem, motivation, etc.? * How do I fine-tune my style of teaching to meet students' needs and abilities? * How do I select content to design instruction that fulfills curricular expectations and also meets students' needs and abilities? * How successful am I at identifying and solving classroom problems?	**3.** Scope of Content Same as ideal	**3.** Scope of Content No attempt is made to generate key topics. Students raise issues related to their own particular situations in an informal group process format. Professor may lecture on specific aspects of the teaching situation. - Evaluation - Contacts with parents - Planning lessons
4. Use of Content/Assignments Students complete written projects that synthesize their learning and experiences in the program.	**4.** Use of Content/ Assignments Same as ideal	**4.** Use of Content/Assignments Any written assignments completed by students are not designed to synthesize learning and experiences.

III. E. Instructional Content

COMPONENT: RESEARCH IN TEACHING SEMINAR

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
* Learning-to-Teach Autobiographies Using information from their entry interviews, applications, questionnaires, course evaluations, and journals, students construct their own stories about their learning-to-teach experiences. Included are: - Influential experiences that shaped my view of myself as a teacher - How I view teaching as a career - Level of my commitment to teaching - My beliefs about the purpose of teaching - Changes and problems I've experienced - What being in the program taught me - What it was like working with my mentor(s) - Where I'll be in 2, 5, and 10 years	* Learning to Teach Autobiographies Using available information, students construct their own stories about their learning-to-teach experiences. The eight items listed in IDEAL column are included in the autobiography.	* Learning-to-Teach Autobiographies Students do not write their autobiographies.
* Action Research Using the Action Research format, students design, implement, evaluate, and present the results of an interactive classroom study. (See IIIB. Section 4 for detailed explanation of design) Action research consists of: - Planning - Reflecting - Implementing - Revising - Observing - Spiraling Honors College students may combine this project with their theses.	* Action Research Same as ideal except those students unable to complete the spiraling component are not penalized.	* Action Research Students do not design, implement, evaluate, and present an interactive classroom study.

IV. A. Instructional Processes

COMPONENT: REFLECTIVE TEACHING STRATEGIES

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
1. The concept of reflection encompasses a way of thinking while standing apart from one's self, an inquiring attitude toward one's practice, cognitively complex reasoning and wondering, and the integration of one's knowledge and experience.	1. Same as ideal	1. Students either do not examin their own beliefs or do not questio the teachings of "experts". The think the way others want them t think.
2. Reflective teaching strategies are designed to encourage students to view the teaching situation as problematic, requiring their input to make decisions and solve problems.	2. Same as ideal	2. Students are not encouraged t view the teaching situation a problematic. Students are expecte to comply with and implemen decisions made by others.
3. Teaching strategies used in seminars are designed for active student participation in: * role-playing/simulations * panel discussions * teaching demonstrations * problem-generating and problem-solving activities * open-ended discussions	3. Same as ideal	3. Teaching strategies used ar designed to illustrate differen points of view, theoretica positions, characteristics, etc Students are engaged in passiv learning much of the time: * listening to lectures * watching movies * reading textbooks/articles * completing worksheets

IV. B. Instructional Processes

COMPONENT: NEW ROLE FOR UNIVERSITY ADVISOR

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
1. ATEP students meet with faculty advisor no less than one time per semester.	1. ATEP students meet with faculty advisor once a year.	1. ATEP student and faculty advisor do not meet.
2. Individualized educational plan is designed to reflect student interest, goals, and expertise as well as professional recommendations of faculty advisors. Student program is individualized through: * deletions * substitutions * waivers * enrollment in graduate level courses * individual research/investigations	2. Same as ideal	2. ATEP student follows routine requirements within program area.
3. Individualized prospectus is filed by advisor and student by the end of the first semester and updated once a semester thereafter.	3. Individualized prospectus is filed by advisor and student by the end of the first year and is updated once a year thereafter.	3. No individualized prospectus is on file.

IV. C. Instructional Processes

COMPONENT: NEW ROLE FOR CLASSROOM TEACHER

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
1. ATEP students and master teachers interview each other; this process is repeated until a match is made.	1. ATEP students are matched with an available master teacher (mentor) with whom they will work for four semesters.	1. ATEP students are randomly assigned to teachers by the placement office.
2. The mentor assumes the role and responsibility of "coach" or model to the prospective teacher. The mentor models the characteristics of a well-educated and dedicated teacher. Mentors provide the following assistance to the students: * individual direction and role modeling * observation and evaluation of interpersonal communication and teaching skills * orientation to the system of school * link between university coursework and classroom experience * understanding of the role of teacher * understanding through reflection, questioning and examination of the strengths and weaknesses of the profession of teaching * curriculum development	2. Same as ideal	2. The mentor does not model the characteristics of a well educated, dedicated teacher or does not provide the appropriate experiences to allow ATEP students to become competent, knowledgeable and reflective teachers.

53

IV. C. Instructional Processes

COMPONENT: NEW ROLE FOR CLASSROOM TEACHER

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
3. Mentor and student work together for 1/2 day per week during the first two semesters, one day per week during the third, and five days per week during the fourth (internship) semester. During this time, the mentor serves as the "clinical expert" and receives support from university personnel.	3. Mentor and student work together on a variable schedule until the internship semester to meet the COE requirement of 300 hours of field experience. During this time period, the mentor receives support from university personnel on an "as needed" basis.	3. Mentor and student do not meet the COE hours requirement for field experience. Mentor receives little or no support from university personnel.

IV. C. Instructional Processes

COMPONENTS: NEW ROLE FOR CLASSROOM TEACHER

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
4. The mentor and student develop a contract of long term and short term goals per semester. At the end of the semester, the goals are evaluated. Students engage in activities such as: * meeting key school personnel * grading papers * preparing lessons * presenting lessons * meeting parents * attending school functions	**4.** No written contract is developed although goals and evaluation are discussed.	**4.** No goals are developed or evaluation conducted.
5. Mentors take the leading role in developing and defining their personal and professional roles with ATEP students. At group meetings, mentors share ideas for procedures and activities.	**5.** Mentors are given a suggested list of activities and guidelines which they may amend or extend in any way.	**5.** Mentors are given a list of required activities which their students must complete each semester. No deviation from this list is accepted.

V. A. Student Evaluation Process

COMPONENT: PRE-INTERNSHIP SEMESTERS

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
1. Individual student knowledge and performance are evaluated each semester by a combination of the seminar professor, faculty advisor, project directors/ coordinator, mentor, and ATEP student.	1. Individual student knowledge and performance are evaluated each year by a combination of at least four of these individuals.	1. Individual student knowledge and performance are evaluated by fewer that four individuals.
2. Evaluation is accomplished using a variety of quantitative and qualitative techniques that measure both the student's knowledge and potential for teaching.	2. Evaluation is accomplished using some quantitative and qualitative techniques that measure the student's level of knowledge and potential for teaching.	2. Evaluation is accomplished using only quantitative techniques, such as grades and the production of adequate lesson plans.
3. Areas in which the student is having problems are identified and worked out by the mentor, student, and at least one other individual involved in the ATEP, such as the program director or coordinator, faculty advisor, or seminar professor. Input is always sought from program staff.	3. Areas in which the student is having problems are identified and worked out by at least two individuals such as the seminar professor and student, mentor and student, or the advisor and student. Input is frequently sought from program staff.	3. Areas in which the student is having problems are identified and worked out by the student. Input is not sought from ATEP staff.

V. A. Student Evaluation Process

COMPONENT: PRE-INTERNSHIP SEMESTERS

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
1. Individual student knowledge and performance are evaluated each semester by a combination of the seminar professor, faculty advisor, project directors/ coordinator, mentor, and ATEP student.	1. Individual student knowledge and performance are evaluated each year by a combination of at least four of these individuals.	1. Individual student knowledge and performance are evaluated by fewer that four individuals.
2. Evaluation is accomplished using a variety of quantitative and qualitative techniques that measure both the student's knowledge and potential for teaching.	2. Evaluation is accomplished using some quantitative and qualitative techniques that measure the student's level of knowledge and potential for teaching.	2. Evaluation is accomplished using only quantitative techniques, such as grades and the production of adequate lesson plans.
3. Areas in which the student is having problems are identified and worked out by the mentor, student, and at least one other individual involved in the ATEP, such as the program director or coordinator, faculty advisor, or seminar professor. Input is always sought from program staff.	3. Areas in which the student is having problems are identified and worked out by at least two individuals such as the seminar professor and student, mentor and student, or the advisor and student. Input is frequently sought from program staff.	3. Areas in which the student is having problems are identified and worked out by the student. Input is not sought from ATEP staff.

V. A. Student Evaluation Process (Continued)

COMPONENT: PRE-INTERNSHIP SEMESTERS

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
4. If retention in the program is not advised due to unresolvable problems (e.g., poor attendance, limited teaching ability, low grades or lack of commitment), a conference involving the student and two staff members is held to discuss reasons for program exit.	4. When intervention and remediation techniques are unsuccessful and student retention in program is not advised, student and an ATEP staff member hold an exit interview.	4. One staff member determines whether student should be removed from program and informs student of decision or student decides to leave program without discussing situation and reasons for departure.
5. Students' teaching skills and abilities are evaluated before the internship semester. Those who do not display appropriate knowledge and behavior do not intern: * content area knowledge * teaching methods * evaluation procedures * interactions with school staff, students, and parents	5. Same as ideal	5. Students' teaching skills and abilities are not evaluated prior to internship semester.

V. B. Student Evaluation Processes

COMPONENT: INTERNSHIP

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
1. ATEP students are supervised by their faculty advisors or ATEP staff certified in content or specialty areas and grade levels who are familiar with the goals of the program.	1. Students are supervised by their faculty advisors, ATEP staff or qualified College of Education student teaching supervisors who are familiar with the goals of the program.	1. Students are supervised by randomly assigned College of Education student teaching supervisors who have little or no knowledge of the ATEP or its goals.
2. Internship supervisors evaluate interns using the standard College of Education student teaching assessment forms as well as obtaining videotaped evidence of the intern's ability to teach reflectively.	2. Internship supervisors evaluate interns using the standard College of Education student teaching assessment forms as well as obtaining evidence presented in field notes of the intern's ability to teach reflectively.	2. Internship supervisors evaluate interns using the standard College of Education assessment forms. No evidence of reflective teaching is obtained.
3. Student performance during the internship is evaluated by a team consisting of the supervisor, mentor/cooperating teacher, and the intern.	3. Same as ideal.	3. Student performance during the internship is evaluated by the supervisor and the cooperating teacher. The intern does not actively participate in this process.

V. C. Student Evaluation Processes

COMPONENT: PROGRAM ASSESSMENT BY STUDENTS

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
1. Students evaluate the four unique aspects of the ATEP each semester on a structured form that requests both quantitative and qualitative information. The four unique aspects are: seminar, mentorship, advisor, individualized programs.	1. Same as ideal except conducted on a yearly basis.	1. Students do not formally evaluate the ATEP on a regular basis.
2. Information gathered from the student evaluations is reviewed, considered, and frequently used in restructuring the program to meet student needs in the four areas.	2. Information from the evaluations is reviewed, considered, and sometimes used to restructure the program to meet the students' needs.	2. If student suggestions are made, they are not considered or used in restructuring the program to meet students' needs.
3. Reports are written each semester and shared with all persons involved in the ATEP including program staff, Planning Council, mentors, advisors, and students.	3. Reports are written each year and shared with many persons involved in the ATEP.	3. Reports are either not written or not shared with persons involved or interested in the ATEP.

VI. A. Program Administration

COMPONENT: ROLES OF STAFF

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
1. Each program staff member has delineated role definitions and responsibilities, developed to result in smooth and defined operating procedures.	1. Program staff members share roles and responsibilities, resulting in generally smooth operating procedures.	1. Program staff members do not understand their roles and responsibilities.
2. Program staff work regularly with other College of Education personnel to design appropriate procedures for integrating ATEP students into standardized requirements and processes. These processes are modified to meet the special needs of ATEP students.	2. Program staff work with other College of Education personnel to design appropriate procedures for integrating ATEP students with students enrolled in traditional teacher education programs. Some modifications are made to meet the student's special circumstances.	2. Program staff work only on a sporadic basis with other College of Education personnel to solve problems experienced by ATEP students. Modifications are not accepted or understood by all personnel.
3. The ATEP Coordinator maintains open communication channels with other College of Education personnel, Planning Council members, faculty members and advisors, seminar professors, students and potential students, public school administrators and teachers, mentors, and others interested in the program. Efforts are made to inform all of the above of any pertinent information.	3. The ATEP Coordinator maintains open communication channels with all internal and external persons involved with the program. Efforts are generally made to inform these individuals about pertinent information.	3. The ATEP Coordinator does not maintain open communication channels with all involved parties. Efforts are not made to inform individuals of important information.
4. Specific individuals from the College of Education are assigned to assist ATEP students in areas such as advanced placement, field experience, and internship. Students are aware of these special arrangements for certification and are formally introduced to these individuals during their first semester in the ATEP.	4. More than one individual from the various departments are involved with assisting ATEP students throughout their programs in the areas mentioned. Students know the names of these individuals. An effort is made to introduce students to these individuals.	4. No individuals from College of Education Departments are assigned to assist ATEP students through their programs. Students follow the same procedures as all other students seeking certification.

VI. B. Program Administration

COMPONENT: INSTITUTIONALIZATION TASKS AND ROLES

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
1. Program handbook is written to assist students, faculty and administrative personnel in processes and procedures for smooth progress through the ATEP. Planning Council members, including student, faculty, staff and COE departmental representatives, participate in task. All program components are included in handbook: * seminars * mentorships * individualized program * advisors * COE requirements	**1.** Worksheets, supplements and fact sheets are used to assist students in completing procedures.	**1.** No handbook is written. Students are solely responsible for discovering and meet requirements for graduation.
2. A yearly calendar is jointly developed by staff from the ATEP, Office of Student Services, and Office of Off Campus Programs and Field Experiences. Processes, procedures and materials for successful progress through program are defined: * advanced standing * field placement * internship * certification	**2.** A yearly calendar is developed by ATEP staff; it is revised, amended and approved by College of Education offices.	**2.** No yearly calendar is developed. Students follow regular procedures.

VI. B. Program Administration (Continued)

COMPONENT: INSTITUTIONALIZATION TASKS AND ROLES

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
3. Program director, coordinator and assistant implement institutionalization jointly with College of Education personnel from offices of Student Services and Off-Campus and Field Placement.	**3.** Same as ideal	**3.** Program is implemented solely by personnel from offices of Student Services and Off-Campus and Field Placements.
4. Program manual is compiled and written to assist future staff in maintaining program. Manual includes loose-leaf information about: * Student recruitment, application and selection procedures and materials * Program evaluation instruments, forms, and results * Student evaluation instruments, forms, and reports * Advisor lists * Mentor information * Month-by-month calendar of suggested activities	**4.** Program materials are compiled and arranged to assist new staff in maintaining program. Files are clearly marked.	**4.** No program manual is written; new staff must search through files for necessary information.

VI. C. Program Administration

COMPONENT: ASSESSMENT, REVIEW AND EVALUATION

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
1. Each program component and process is assessed, reviewed, and/or evaluated by all appropriate individuals or groups involved with the program: - Planning Council - Students - Mentors - Advisors - Seminar Professors - School District Administrators - College of Education Personnel - ATEP Staff - Other	1. Program components and processes are assessed, reviewed, and/or evaluated by a variety of groups and individuals involved with the program.	1. Program components are not formally assessed, reviewed, or evaluated by appropriate individuals or groups.
2. Student recruitment, application, and selection processes and materials are reviewed an evaluated by: - Students selected into program - Students who requested applications but did not apply. - Planning Council Selection Committee - College of Education Faculty Members - ATEP Staff	2. Materials and processes are reviewed and evaluated by two or three groups/ individuals.	2. Processes and materials are reviewed but not formally evaluated.
* Data collected are used to revised processes and materials.	* Data collected are considered when revising processes and materials.	* Data are not used; revisions are based on expediency or personal opinions.

VI. C. Program Administration

COMPONENT: ASSESSMENT REVIEW AND EVALUATION

3. Students' performance and progress are reviewed and evaluated by: - Students - Advisors - Seminar Professors - Mentors - Planning Council - ATEP Staff	**3.** Students' performance and progress are reviewed and evaluated by at least five groups or individuals.	**3.** Students' performance and progress are reviewed and evaluated by four or fewer groups or individuals.
4. Individualized education programs, jointly designed by advisors and students, are reviewed and/or evaluated by: - Advisors - Students - College of Education Personnel - Mentors - ATEP Staff	**4.** Same as ideal except that the Planning Council will not formally review or evaluate individualized education program when ATEP is instituion-alized.	**4.** Individualized education programs are reviewed and/or evaluated by fewer than 5 groups/individuals.
5. Seminars are evaluated by: - Students - Seminar Professors - Planning Council - ATEP Staff	**5.** Same as ideal except that the Planning Council will not formally evaluate seminars when program is institutionalized.	**5.** Seminars are not formally evaluated by appropriate groups/individuals.

VI. C. Program Administration

COMPONENT: ASSESSMENT, REVIEW AND EVALUATION

6. Various aspects of advisors' roles, responsibilities, and decisions are reviewed and/or evaluated by: - Advisors - Students - Planning Council - College of Education Personnel - ATEP Staff	**6.** Same as ideal except that the Planning Council will not formally review or evaluate functions of advisors when program is institutionalized.	**6.** Advisor component is not reviewed or evaluated by appropriate groups/individuals.
7. Mentors' roles responsibilities, and satisfaction levels are reviewed and/or evaluated by: - Mentors - Students - Planning Council - Advisors - School District Administrators - ATEP Staff	**7.** Same as ideal	**7.** Mentor component is not formally reviewed or evaluated by appropriate groups/ individuals.
8. Mentor nomination, recruitment and selection procedures and materials are reviewed and evaluated by: - Current Mentors - Potential Mentors who chose not to participate - Planning Council - ATEP Staff - School District Administrators	**8.** Procedures and materials are reviewed and evaluated three or four groups/ individuals.	**8.** Procedures and materials are reviewed but not formally evaluated.
* Data collected are used to revise procedures and materials.	* Data collected are considered when revising procedures and materials.	* Data are not used; revisions based on personal opinions.